

ew



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,249	03/10/2004	David J. Palmowski	439P776R	5910

7590 01/25/2005
George R McGuire
Bond Schoeneck & King PLLC
One Lincoln Center
Syracuse, NY 13202

EXAMINER

MEISLIN, DEBRA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/798,249	Applicant(s) PALMOWSKI, DAVID J.	
	Examiner Debra S Meislin	Art Unit 3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DEFECTIVE REISSUE OATH/DECLARATION

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to identify at least one error which is relied upon to support the reissue application. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414.

Any error in the claims must be identified by reference to the **specific** claim(s) and the **specific** claim language wherein lies the error. There is no **specific** statement that describes any error. The declaration does not give **an example of a limitation** is being omitted. **A specific limitation must be identified that is either being added or removed.**

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

SUPPORT FOR CHANGES MADE, 37 CFR 1.173(c)

3. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.173(c)

“Status of claims and support for claim changes. Whenever there is an amendment to the claims pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section, there must also be supplied, on pages separate from the pages containing the changes, the status (i.e., pending or canceled), as of the date of the amendment, of all patent claims and of all added claims, and an explanation of the support in the disclosure of the patent for the changes made to the claims.”

An explanation of the support in the disclosure of the patent for the changes made to the claims has not been made. An explanation of the support must be made.

ART REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b) AND 103(a)

Art Unit: 3723

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 23-25 and 27-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stepan ('828).

Note column 4, lines 9-12 which indicates the use of stepping motors for moving the gripping members.

number of insulation stripping steps. The centering jaws
10 9 and the blades 8 could also be positioned by means of
DC motors with decoders instead of a potentiometer, or
by means of stepping motors.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepan ('828) in view of Aikens ('164).

Stepan discloses all of the claimed subject matter except for having a single blade with a circular opening movable in an orbital path. Aikens discloses a single blade with a circular opening movable in an orbital path. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the blades of Stepan as a single blade with a circular opening movable in an orbital path to provide simple, fast, and adjustable removal of wire insulation as taught by Aikens.

8. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepan ('828) in view of Carpenter et al ('287).

Stepan discloses all of the claimed subject matter except for having a microprocessor. Stepan discloses the use of a digital controller. Carpenter discloses the use of a microprocessor in a wire stripping device. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the digital controller of Stepan as a microprocessor to allow for automated operation of the device as taught by Carpenter et al.

9. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepan ('828) in view of English et al ('941).

Stepan discloses all of the claimed subject matter except for having the blade being positioned between the clamping jaws and the members. English et al discloses blades (50) being positioned between the clamping jaws (40, to the left of the blades) and the members (40, to the right of the blades) as shown in figure 2. See also column 2, lines 56-60 of English et al. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the clamping jaws, blade and members of Stepan such that the blade is positioned between the clamping jaws and the members to allow for the gripping and stripping of cables as taught by English et al.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3723

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

11. Regarding the defective reissue oath/declaration filed with this application, applicant must identify the **specific** claim language wherein lies the error. This may be accomplished by setting forth the specific claim language that is being omitted and/or added in quotation marks.

It is noted that the recitation "first and second linear stepper motors respectively connected to said pair of gripping members" does not define over the cited art in a vacuum. It is the combination of elements claimed that define allowability.

CONTACT INFORMATION

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra S Meislin whose telephone number is 571 272-4487. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Debra S Meislin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3723

January 11, 2005